

Thomas Combs
61 Georgia Way
San Leandro CA 94577

Sep 5th 2018

Via ECFS
Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

**Re: In the Matter of Petition of USTelecom for Forbearance Pursuant to
47 U.S.C. Section 160(c); WC Docket No. 18-141; Category 1**

Dear FCC,

I have residential DSL and landline (POTS) phone service from a local CLEC provider, using copper circuits between my residence and the CO that are rented from AT&T. I use a local CLEC provider instead of AT&T itself because:

1. I get faster DSL service than AT&T provides, because the local CLEC provider has co-located modern DSL equipment in the CO, while AT&T still uses antiquated CO DSL equipment.
2. My CLEC's landline (POTS) service has more features than AT&T provides (such as SPAM call blocking; unlimited calling to over 60 foreign countries, etc.) at a lower price than AT&T charges.

It's important that the FCC continue to maintain regulations that require AT&T to make these copper loops, and CO co-location space, available to local CLEC providers at a fair price. Otherwise AT&T will simply price their CLEC competition out of business, and residential customers will be left with substandard service on antiquated AT&T CO equipment.

Note that AT&T itself has not built-out FTTN to my residence, so DSL is the only option AT&T offers me for internet service. If AT&T itself has not built-out FTTN (much less FTTC or FTTH), it's ridiculous for AT&T (through US Telecom) to argue that all of the CLECs have had plenty of time to build-out complete fiber networks. The FCC needs to deny the US Telecom petition, and continue regulating the wholesale access that the CLECs need.

Thomas Combs